



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Yuma Field Office
2555 East Gila Ridge Road
Yuma, AZ 85365
YFOWEB_AZ@blm.gov



DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) FORM

DNA-AZ-320-2005-0023

Case/Project No.: AZA 25497

PROJECT NAME: Eagletail Trail Rehabilitation (Continuation)

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

(T)	Program	Reviewer	Signature	Date
	Air Quality			
	ACEC			
T	Botanical including T & E Spp.	F. Wong		
	Communications (Dispatch)			
T	Cultural/Paleontology	S. Arnold		
	Energy Policy			
	Environmental Justice			
	Farmlands (Prime & Unique)			
	Fire Management			
	Floodplain			
T	Hazardous Material	S. Fusilier		
T	Invasive & Non-Native Species	F. Wong		
	Lands/Realty			
T	Land Law Examiner	C. Holzer		
	Law Enforcement			
	Minerals			
	Native American Religious Concerns	S. Arnold		
	Operations			
	Range Management	R. Oyler		
T	Recreation	R. Morfin		
	Soils			
	Surface Protection			
T	Visual Resources	R. Morfin		
	Water Rights			
	Water Quality (Surface & Ground)			
	Wetlands/Riparian Zones			
	Wild & Scenic Rivers			
T	Wilderness	R. Morfin		
	Wild Horses/Burros			
T	Wildlife including T & E Spp.	F. Wong		

Prepared by: _____

Michael F. Dobyns
Wilderness ECO

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Karen Reichhardt
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Karla Norris
Assistant Field Manager for Recreation and Visitor Services

Date: _____



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Yuma Field Office
2555 East Gila Ridge Road
Yuma, AZ 85365
YFOWEB_AZ@blm.gov



Decision Record For Eagletail Trail Rehabilitation DNA-AZ-320-2005-0023

Decision

It is my decision to continue the rehabilitation of a vehicle trail in the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness, sec. 31 and 32 T. 1 N., R. 10 W. and sec. 3, 4, 9, 16, 20, 21, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, T. 1 N., R. 11 W., Gila and Salt River Meridian, La Paz and Maricopa counties. The two-track trail will be rehabilitated into a single-track hiking route by means of using only hand tools in accordance with the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan.

Rationale for Decision

This proposed action is addressed as a specific management action within the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan. The overall reduction of visual impact and enhancement of Wilderness character resulting from this action not only improves opportunities for recreation, but also deters future unauthorized vehicle use in Wilderness.

This decision is in conformance with and supported by the Yuma District Resource Management Plan, as amended; the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan, the Lower Gila South Wilderness EIS, and the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan.

Yuma District Resource Management Plan as Amended

In September 1995 the appropriate decisions from the Phoenix District planning documents were incorporated into the Yuma District RMP, through an Administrative Determination, in order to create a single, comprehensive planning document for the Yuma District.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan

States that future, more site-specific decisions will be made, such as directing the management intensity of different resources, developing activity plans Wilderness area management plans or issuing rights of way, leases, or permits.

Lower Gila South Final Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement

States that Wilderness designation will close 106.25 miles of vehicle ways and around 119,700 acres to motorized recreation use.

The Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan

States that designated hiking trails will be narrowed, not completely rehabilitated. The proposed action is specifically outlined in the management actions of the above plan.

Management and Mitigation Considerations

All mitigation measures are incorporated within the proposed action.

Monitoring

Monitoring of the project will be performed by the BLM in order to ensure the safety of volunteers and the efficacy of rehabilitation techniques. Subsequent visits to the project location will determine the permanence of the rehabilitation and guide in planning future projects.

The Proposed Action will have no effect on the President's Energy Policy and a Statement of Adverse Energy Impact is not required.

Rebecca Heick
Field Manager, Yuma

Date

Worksheet
Interim Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

A. Describe the Proposed Action

The proposed action is the rehabilitation of approximately 3 miles of vehicle trail in the northern portion of the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness, sec. 31 and 32 T. 1 N., R. 10 W. and sec. 3, 4, 9, 16, 20, 21, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, T. 1 N., R. 11 W., Gila and Salt River Meridian, La Paz and Maricopa Counties. As specified in the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan, the two-track trail would be rehabilitated into a single-track hiking route already designated as the Ben Avery Trail. Volunteers under the supervision of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Wilderness specialists would perform the work. In accordance with the Wilderness Act, which restricts the use of mechanized equipment in designated Wilderness, rehabilitation would be accomplished with hand tools only. The process consists of loosening the compacted soil of the vehicle trail, pulling berms into one of the individual tracks, and rearranging surrounding rocks to reduce visual impacts. The end result is the restoration of surface contour and texture to its natural state.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 compliance documentation for the proposed action will be completed for segments of the vehicle route corridor as the project progresses. No action will be performed on any section of the vehicle trail until the BLM has complied with the NHPA of 1966, as amended, implementing regulations 36 CFR § 800, and other cultural resource laws and regulations. Consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office will be completed as appropriate prior to implementation. Mitigation measures will be developed and followed to protect cultural resources found in the project area. All cultural resource reports, mitigation plans, and other necessary documentation will be filed at the BLM Yuma Field Office upon completion. Any Native American religious concerns shared with BLM during the consultation process would be addressed pursuant to applicable laws and regulations prior to project implementation.

The project lead will be ultimately responsible for ensuring that the project and the work crew comply with all resource laws, regulations, and stipulations. While work would be strictly confined to the disturbed area of the vehicle trail, in consideration of cultural, paleontological, and biological (T & E habitat) resources, all involved personnel would be instructed to halt all activity should any previously unidentified resources be discovered in the project area. In such a case, the appropriate BLM resource specialist will be notified immediately. Work may not resume until written authorization to proceed is issued by the BLM. As the invasive plant, Sahara Mustard (*Brassica tournefortii*), has been reported in sections of the project area, tools and personnel would be screened and cleaned after project completion in order to prevent the spread of seeds to uninfested areas.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

: The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Yuma District Resource Management Plan, as amended
Date Approved May 1986 & Feb 1987

In September 1995 the appropriate decisions from the Phoenix District planning documents were incorporated into the Yuma District Resource Management Plan (RMP),

through an Administrative Determination, in order to create a single, comprehensive planning document for the Yuma District.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan, as amended
Date Approved June 1988

States that future, more site-specific decisions would be made, such as directing the management intensity of different resources, developing activity plans, Wilderness area management plans, or issuing rights of way, leases, or permits.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Lower Gila South Final Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement
Date Approved April 1987

States that Wilderness designation would close 106.25 miles of vehicle ways and around 119,700 acres to motorized recreation use.

The Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan
Date Approved Feb 1995

States that designated hiking trails will be narrowed, not completely rehabilitated. The proposed action is specifically outlined in the management actions of the above plan.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The proposed action is substantially the same as elements analyzed in the environmental assessment for the Eagletail Mountains Wilderness Management Plan. Management actions in the plan specify that designated hiking trails would be narrowed, but not completely rehabilitated. In addition, it states that priority surface reclamation should begin with closed vehicle routes. The management plan goes on to describe the Ben Avery Trail as a priority in this context.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documentation remains appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. Environmental and resource concerns and associated interests have not substantially changed since the Wilderness Management Plan was finalized.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

The existing analysis remains valid considering new information and circumstances. In addition to the critical elements analyzed in the management plan, the proposed action would not adversely affect energy policy, environmental justice, or invasive, non-native species which have been added as critical elements since the original analysis.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The methodology and analytical approach of the existing NEPA documentation remains appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. The proposed action was specifically considered by the previous analysis.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action have not changed substantially from those analyzed in the NEPA documents cited above. The previous NEPA analyses address the same site-specific impacts for the proposed action.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

The proposed action would result in no cumulative impacts beyond those previously addressed in the above-cited NEPA documents as it was specifically analyzed and included as a management action.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

The public involvement and review process for the NEPA documents cited above is adequate for the proposed action. As the action was specifically included in the existing management plan, previously submitted and accepted by the public review process, it is covered by the existing documentation.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title
<i>Fred Wong</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist</i>
<i>Sandra Arnold</i>	<i>Archaeologist</i>
<i>Ron Morfin</i>	<i>Wilderness Lead</i>
Steve Fusilier	Acting Assistant Field Manager
Roger Oyler	Rangeland Management Specialist

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
Rebecca Heick
Field Manager, Yuma

Categorical Exclusion Review

Department of the Interior Departmental Manual 516 2.3.A (3) provides for a review of the following categorical exclusion criteria to determine if exceptions apply to this project. The following exceptions apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (CX). Environmental documents must be prepared for actions which may:

CRITERIA	YES	NO
1. Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety.	_____	<u> X </u>
2. Have adverse effects on such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks.	_____	<u> X </u>
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects.	_____	<u> X </u>
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	_____	<u> X </u>
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.	_____	<u> X </u>
6. Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	_____	<u> X </u>
7. Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.	_____	<u> X </u>
8. Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	_____	<u> X </u>
9. Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.	_____	<u> X </u>
10. Threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	_____	<u> X </u>